DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 271 967 FL 015 824

TITLE	Bilingual Education Pilot Programs Interim Study Report. Staff Report to the State Board of Education.
INSTITUTION	Texas Education Agency, Austin.
PUB DATE	11 Jan 85
NOTE	59p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement; *Bilingual Education Programs; Comparative Analysis; Curriculum Development; Elementary Secondary Education; *Language Skills; Limited English Speaking; *Pilot Projects; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Program Implementation; Skill Development; Statewide Planning; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	Texas

ABSTRACT

This report presents results of evaluations of elementary and secondary level bilingual education programs in nine Texas school districts, focusing on ways to serve the needs of limited-English-speaking populations. Differing evaluation procedures were used, and the results reflect a wide range of procedures. The report consists of a description of the overall study and specific program evaluation requirements, presentation of the process and product evaluation findings, and conclusions. Brief descriptions of each participating program, and an extensive description of El Paso's program and its requirements are appended. Major conclusions for all of the participating districts are that: (1) both pilot and non-pilot programs demonstrated improved English proficiency and, where data were available, academic achievement; (2) some pilot programs suffered from insufficient trained staff to fully implement the programs, and extremely high student mobility rates detracted from sequential skills building; (3) continued study of student cohort groups will provide more substantive information about appropriate instructional designs at the elementary level; and (4) existing requirements are now inadequate for secondary-level students. An executive summary is included. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED271967

REPORT

BILINGUAL EDUCATION PILOT PROGRAMS INTERIM STUDY REPORT

Eric/CII
JUL 8 1986
RECEIVED

Staff Report to the State Board of Education January 11, 1985

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Kemp

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Texas Education Agency
Austin, Texas

FL 015824

Table of Contents

	Page
Executive Summary	1
Introduction	4
Background	4
Related Research	6
Limitations	8
Site Selection	9
Program Descriptions	11
Evaluation Requirements	12
Findings	13
Process Evaluation	14
Product Evaluation-Elementary	16
Product Evaluation-Secondary	17
Conclusions	18
Appendix	21
Laredo ISD	22
McAllen ISD	23
Fort Worth ISD	24
Brownsville ISD	25
Houston ISD	26
Port Arthur ISD	27
Dallas ISD	28
San Felipe-Del Rio Consolidated ISD	30
El Paso ISD	31

Bilingual Education Pilot Programs
Interim Study Report
Executive Summary

Purpose of the Study: This study is in response to TEC 21.454 et seq., Pilot Programs in Bilingual Education and Special Language Programs. The purpose of the study is to identify approaches that are effective for developing English proficiency for limited English proficient (LEP) students.

Sample: As of the end of the 1983-84 school year, nine school districts were authorized to conduct pilot programs exploring alternative approaches to addressing the needs of LEP students at the elementary and/or secondary level. While participating districts do not represent a true cross-section of all types of districts in the state, there are sufficient uniquenesses among the communities represented to provide limited assessment of program results across different populations. Districts operating programs through the 1983-84 school year were:

Elementary Level	Secondary Level
Dallas ISD	Brownsville ISD
Fort Worth ISD	Dallas ISD
Houston ISD	El Paso ISD
Laredo ISD	Fort Worth ISD
McAllen ISD	Houston ISD
	Port Arthur ISD
	San Felipe/Del Rio CISD

Data Collection: Each participating district was required to conduct an annual evaluation of its program. Those operating programs at the elementary level were further required to provide a longitudinal design with an initial reporting date for student achievement data in the summer of 1984 and further information through the 1985-86 school year. No standardized procedures for reporting were imposed since the limited number of pilot sites yielded vastly different local testing policies and obvious differences among program instructional designs. Beyond information made available by participants in their applications and reports, this study reflects observations made by Texas Education Agency staff through on-site monitoring and technical assistance visits beginning in the spring of 1982 and culminating in the fall of 1984.

Results of the Study: The information in this report reflects a wide range of findings concerning the pilot programs including implementation and student achievement. The fact that the results are mixed is not unexpected given the length of time these programs have been operating and the pre-existing lack of consistent research indicating superiority of any given approach for all types of students qualifying for services.

Preliminary information, available for purposes of this report, must be viewed in light of study limitations. These limitations include inconsistent implementation across campuses and classrooms, combination of instructional approaches for students in Grades 2 through 5, local district testing policies which dramatically reduce sample sizes, and questionable comparison groups or controls at some pilot sites. Findings and conclusions at the elementary level reflect only initial, tentative assessment of program impact.

Major findings and conclusions across all participating local programs are:

1. While no assessment was made of the appropriateness of traditional bilingual program implementation for purposes of this report, both pilot and non-pilot programs demonstrated improved student English language proficiency and, where data were available, academic achievement. Students generally showed upward trends with respect to norm-referenced status (i.e., percentile rank) and mastery of basic skills in language arts and mathematics. At the elementary level where limited comparisons could be made, students participating in pilot programs were able to show growth equal to or greater than students in the comparison settings at all but one site. While these results varied by grade and subject matter, the pattern of success for participants in all three types of pilots (i.e., intensive ESL, immersion, and bilingual transfer) demonstrated that alternative instructional approaches for LEP students can be equally beneficial. At the secondary level, the alternative pilot programs found success where historic trends for LEP students were dominated by failure and high dropout rates. Success was measured both in development of English language skills as well as content acquisition in secondary academic subject matter.

2. Some pilot programs suffered from insufficient certified, endorsed and trained staff to fully implement programs designed to address the needs of their LEP students. Added to this, pilot programs noted extremely high student mobility rates which tended to detract from longitudinal designs aimed at sequential skills building.

3. Continued investigation of student cohort groups will provide greater substantive information as to appropriate instructional designs for LEP students at the elementary level. At the secondary level, evidence obtained through pilot programs indicates that existing requirements are insufficient to meet the needs of the LEP students.

A final technical report examining in greater detail the various aspects of the Bilingual Education Pilot Program is available from the Texas Education Agency.

Introduction. The following is an interim report on program development and resulting student growth for the pilot bilingual education programs operating through the 1983-84 school year. These programs operated under the authority of Section 21.454 of the Texas Education Code. Pilot programs were initiated during the second semester of the 1981-82 school year and implemented for the first full year in 1982-83 at all but one site. The final site began implementation during the 1982-1983 school year.

This report summarizes information obtained through on-site monitoring visits culminating in the fall of 1984 and through reports submitted to the Texas Education Agency by the nine participating districts. The district reports encompass a broad range of evaluation topics including: student and staffing characteristics, staff development efforts, instructional designs, and measures of academic growth for participating students and, where applicable, a comparison group of students receiving traditional bilingual services.

Background to the Study. January 2, 1968, marked the beginning of federal efforts to meet the needs of students with limited English language skills. Public Law 90-247, passed on that date, was to provide equal opportunities and access to limited English proficient (LEP) students. By 1974, the U. S. Supreme Court, in a unanimous decision concerning a case involving non-English-speaking Chinese students (Lau vs. Nichols), noted that discrimination had occurred because students were receiving instruction only in English, a language they did not understand and hence were not being helped to learn.

The impact of this decision redefined the intent and implementation of the Bilingual Education Act (P.L. 90-247). The concept of voluntary use of native languages in the classroom was interpreted to mean that language rights were synonymous with civil rights. Schools were given specific directives by the federal government that children must not be denied full participation in the education process while they were learning English. This brought to an end the past practice of placing LEP students in the same classroom as native speakers of English and utilizing traditional all-English materials and instructional treatments. Federal support to school districts for bilingual education was based on meeting the requirements of the 1978 Bilingual Education Act. This meant that programs using a single language of instruction were effectively precluded from competing for these federal monies.

Bilingual education thus became a program of dual language instruction allowing for learning basic skills through the student's native language while providing for the carefully structured and sequenced mastery of English language skills. Instruction in the second language (ESL) was also deemed

appropriate for meeting the needs of LEP students. English as a second language (ESL) programs focused solely on intensive instruction in English and the incorporation of cultural aspects of the students' backgrounds into meaningful language-learning experiences.

Bilingual education is frequently considered compensatory in nature, not because the recipients are language minority students from poor backgrounds, but because the expressed intent of these programs--philosophically, legislatively, and programmatically--is to assist the learning ability of LEP students and to enhance the English language. Therefore, bilingual education is not to restore the student's language but rather to develop it by compensating in the program offering for the presumed linguistic barriers which LEP students bring to school. Regardless of the approach used or the acceptance of the compensatory nature of the instruction, the rationale for bilingual education can be stated as follows:

> "Lack of English proficiency is the major reason for language minority students' academic failure. Bilingual education is intended to ensure that students do not fall behind in subject matter content while they are learning English, as they would likely do in an all-English program. However, when students have become proficient in English then they can be exited to an all-English program, since limited English proficiency will no longer impede their academic progress." - United States Commission on Civil Rights, 1975

It is sufficient to recognize that a state, with as large a concentration of non-English-speaking school-age children as Texas, could not help but be dramatically influenced by any position taken in Washington, D.C.

The debate over appropriate strategies for providing instruction to students with limited English language development has continued at the national level. At the local district level, questions have been raised by teachers, administrators and parents of students impacted by bilingual education with regard to what constitutes appropriate instruction in each language. This debate and questioning continues in view of a lack of clear, indisputable research to support one particular instructional approach for all identified LEP students.

Debate may occur concerning the goals of bilingual education; yet, as a meaningful program aimed at the educational needs of non-English-speaking students, it is clearly recognizable that in Texas bilingual education is a major component of legislatively sponsored public education. In fact, documents produced by legislative mandate and/or the State Board of Education clearly delineate the interpretation of appropriate bilingual education.

"Bilingual education or special language programs as defined by this act shall be taught in the public schools only for the purpose of assisting the learning ability of limited English proficiency students and to enhance the English language." - Section 2, S.B. 477, Acts of the 67th Legislature, Regular Session, 1981

"The bilingual education program established by a school district shall be a full-time program of dual-language instruction that provides for learning basic skills in the primary language of the students of limited English proficiency who are enrolled in the program and that provides for carefully structured and sequenced mastery of English language skills. The program shall be designed to consider the students' learning experiences and shall incorporate the cultural aspects of the students' backgrounds." - Chapter 77, Subchapter R 77.353 (a), Texas Education Code

In this environment, the 67th Legislature, Regular Session, enacted Senate Bill 477 which amended Sections 21.451-21.463 of the Texas Education Code. On July 11, 1981, the State Board of Education adopted rules pursuant to legislative requirements which authorized the Commissioner of Education to approve up to 20 pilot programs. These pilot programs were to be designed and evaluated in such a way as to provide specific information about how alternative methods of instruction in bilingual education and special language programs for LEP students work in districts with varying characteristics. The major purpose of evaluation for these programs initially was to provide information on three general questions of interest:

- To what extent does a particular pilot program produce results as measured by indicators of student progress?
- How do the results produced by a pilot program compare with other programs in the district established to serve comparable groups of students?
- To what extent does a particular pilot program facilitate social integration of participants in the total school community?

Related Research. The issue of how best to meet the instructional needs of limited English proficient students is neither a recent nor untested question. Studies in foreign countries, particularly Canada, and numerous programs operating throughout the United States provided research and evaluation data creating a wide range of opinions about the value and success of various dual language and English language immersion approaches to bilingual education.

It is not the purpose of this study to reopen debate over the issue of which approach is preferable, but rather to ascertain if various approaches can prove to be effective. The existing available research is beneficial in that it provides the context within which pilot programs were designed. It further provided guidelines for the evaluation of those programs.

The following list provides a cross-section of studies on this topic. These materials demonstrate that there is no overwhelming consensus as to which approaches work, and how well, for varying types of students.

1. Research Evidence for the Effectiveness of Bilingual Education, by Rudolph Troike. Available through the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education or NABE Journal, Vol. III, No. 1, Fall, 1978.

2. Synthesis of Research on Bilingual Education by Rudolph Troike. Educational Leadership, Vol. 38, No. 6, March, 1981.

3. Bilingual Education and the Hispanic Challenge , by Alan Pifer. Reprinted from the 1979 Annual Report, Carnegie Corporation of New York.

4. The Entry and Exit Fallacy in Bilingual Education by Jim Cummins. NABE Journal, Vol. IV, No. 3, Spring, 1980.

5. The Role of Primary Language Development in Promoting Educational Success for Language Minority Students by Jim Cummins. Paper prepared for the California State Department of Education Compendium on Bilingual-Bicultural Education.

6. Evaluation of the Impact of ESEA Title VII Spanish/English Bilingual Education Programs, Volumes I and III by Malcolm Danoff et al. Available from the American Institutes for Research, Palo Alto, California.

7. A Comparison of the Effects of Language Background and Socioeconomic Status on Achievement Among Elementary School Students by Alvin Rosenthal , et. Al. Available through the U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D. C.

8. Effectiveness of Bilingual Education: A Review of the Literature by Keith Baker and Adriana de Kanter. Available through the Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation, Washington, D. C.

9. Ideological Bias in Bilingual Education Research by Keith Baker. A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April, 1984.

10. Studies of Immersion Education. Book prepared under the direction of the Office of Bilingual-Bicultural Education, California State Department of Education.

11. Condition of Bilingual Education in the Nation, 1984. Report of the Secretary of Education to the Congress and the President.

It was not intended that research in this pilot study effort be aligned with positions taken by authors in the above-mentioned studies and reports. However, it is sufficient to recognize that any study of alternative approaches to instructing LEP students is not breaking new ground.

Limitations of the Study. The generalizability of these interim findings is limited in a number of ways:

1. The limited number of programs which have participated over the entire duration of the pilot study has reduced the potential to observe the impact of programs in a wide range of settings. The extent to which specific program designs are replicable or applicable to various types of school districts has not been addressed.

2. The change of program design for pilot sites at the elementary level meant that only those students entering the second grade in 1984-85 have experienced continuity in the alternative, pilot program. All other elementary students in this study experienced some combination of instructional approaches. Therefore, the cause of academic growth cannot be attributed to any specific program. As additional cohorts of students are observed, it will be possible to minimize confounding factors. These factors included first year implementation problems experienced as programs were expanded across grades. Also, the high rate of student mobility frequently left insufficient numbers of students upon which to base significance of student achievement outcomes.

3. Testing policies in some districts did not permit the assessment of LEP students with tests in the English language. This ultimately meant that only those students with demonstrable growth in English language development had standardized test scores. Frequently, a large percentage of students had no scores upon which to base comparisons. This factor, combined with high

student mobility, dramatically reduced the generalizability of some findings.

4. Project implementation for pilot programs tends to be dynamic in nature. During the first two years of this study, local districts were constantly making changes and refinements to their programs. This meant that variance in the programs from semester-to-semester as well as year-to-year was extremely noticeable at some sites. Added to this element of change, it was observed by local evaluators that variance among classrooms within a school as well as across campuses was frequently quite noticeable. As a limitation, this realistic assessment of the dynamics of implementing any instructional program, particularly one that may not have total support among teachers, administrators and the community, seems to indicate that program design elements must be couched in broad descriptive terms rather than finite, stable elements.

5. This study is longitudinal by design and intent. Findings and conclusions at the elementary level reflect only initial, tentative assessment of program impact. Participating districts strongly supported the concept that results available at the end of the 1983-84 school year should not be viewed as definitive. Interim findings were perceived as indicators of potential program success as well as a means by which appropriate design alterations would be considered.

Site Selection. In the fall of 1981, information was disseminated statewide informing all districts that the purpose of pilot programs was to provide special language programs for LEP students consistent with approaches identified in State Board of Education rule 77.364. These approaches were as follows:

1. Concentrated English as a second language in varying time allotments and organizational structures;

2. Variations and refinements of language use in dual language programs at varying grade levels;

3. English as a second language or bilingual education programs within regular classrooms;

4. Varying English as a second language structures for the elementary and secondary levels;

5. Tutoring in English; and

6. Parental participation in learning English.

Districts were further notified that authorization for pilot program status could be for one, two, or more years based on program design. Districts were informed that the regular bilingual education funding allocations of $50.00 per participating student could be utilized to support program costs.

In determining potential sites for pilot programs, attempts were made to include districts with varying characteristics. Special attention was given to districts with differing concentrations of limited English proficient students, districts representing various regions of the state, and districts experiencing difficulty in employing sufficient numbers of bilingual teachers.

Over 30 districts were identified by staff at the Texas Education Agency as potential sites for one or more of the suggested approaches. These districts provided variance across most characteristics of interest in the study. Telephone inquiries to the potential sample districts were made to determine willingess to apply for pilot program status. A general mailing was made to all districts on October 8, 1981 requesting proposals for pilot projects and providing guidelines for the development of proposals for projects in bilingual education and special language programs. By October 26, 1981, responses were obtained from many of the districts previously contacted, as well as a small number of districts who had not been contacted. The application review process involved extensive study by staff from the Agency divisions of Bilingual Education and Planning and Research.

On January 8, 1982, a list of recommended sites for pilot programs was submitted to the State Board of Education for approval. The table below identifies the pilot study group which participated through the 1983-84 school year. It should be noted that Laredo ISD was added to the list during the 1982-83 school year. For 1984-85, El Paso ISD has expanded to an elementary program of ESL Partial Day and Partial Immersion, and Port Arthur ISD has returned to a traditional ESL model due to staffing constraints.

District	ESL Partial Day	Total Immer-sion in English	ESL Content Areas	Bilin-gual Transfer	Bilin-gual Educ.
Elementary:					
Dallas ISD	X		X		
Ft. Worth ISD		X			
Houston ISD		X			
McAllen ISD		X		X	
Laredo ISD	X	X			
Secondary:					
Port Arthur ISD	X				X
Brownsville ISD	X		X		
El Paso ISD	X		X		
Ft. Worth ISD	X				
Houston ISD	X				
San Felipe/Del Rio CISD	X		X		

Program Descriptions and Instructional Strategies. Applicants for pilot program status were asked to propose a program design considering one of six potential approaches. The nine participating districts can be clustered with respect to the approach selected. A brief description of each pilot program is contained in the Appendix.

At the elementary level, programs can be grouped into three categories:

1. Those employing ESL methodology in a traditional all English setting with varying times and degrees of English language development,

2. Those providing partial or total English immersion with bilingual teachers and a varying provision for Spanish language use, and

3. A transfer model focusing on existing bilingual program requirements allowing for use of English consistent with individual student growth.

Programs at the secondary level provided at least one period of intensive ESL language instruction per day. Beyond this common element, differences among programs represent local district objectives and the ability to provide specific programs. The amount of time allocated to English language development ranged from one to four periods in a six period day. This obvious difference should not be interpreted as a variance in philosophy among the participating districts. Differences

resulted from scheduling problems, as well as numbers and types of students. Content area instruction ranged from intensive sheltered classes to low ability grouping within specific required subjects.

General Evaluation Requirements. Participating districts were required to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the pilot program. The local evaluation design included both process evaluation, to describe the program actually implemented, and product evaluation, to draw conclusions concerning the effectiveness of the program. Information from the process and product evaluation was to be used locally to make program refinements when necessary and to share information with other districts for replication purposes. In addition to conducting the local evaluation, districts were expected to maintain raw data on students enrolled in the program for use in broader evaluations of the pilot projects.

In general, designs for local evaluations contained procedures for collecting information to answer the following questions:

1. What are the important characteristics of the program?
2. What was the context in which it operated?
3. Did a measurable change in the participating students' English proficiency occur?
4. How likely is it that the observed effects resulted from the approach?

Frequently, the designs also included procedures for collecting data elements for reporting to the Texas Education Agency:

A. Student Descriptors

   1. age, sex, and grade
   2. country of birth
   3. free and reduced price lunch eligibility
   4. number of years enrolled in the district
   5. number of days membership in the pilot program
   6. hours per day in the pilot program
   7. attendance rate during the pilot program year (percent)

8. migrant status

9. student/instructional staff ratio

B. Student Performance Data

1. Pre/Post Language Proficiency Test scores and dates of testing in English and the primary language.

2. Pre/Post Standardized Achievement Test percentile or normal curve equivalent scores and test administration dates in the following areas: reading, mathematics, language arts, science, and social studies.

The extent to which the above variables were collected and maintained is largely dependent on the staffing and data processing capabilities of each participating district. Furthermore, not all variables are applicable to each pilot program.

All participating districts provided greater evaluation resources to this pilot program study than was allocated to similar programmatic efforts. Because evaluation requirements during formative periods of program development and implementation can be perceived as burdensome, unnecessary and at times misleading, obvious differences among participating districts in providing timely, quality information should not be interpreted as an unwillingness to meet the needs of this study. In general, this study has created an excellent atmosphere for shared research. Participating district personnel and Agency staff have collaborated to ensure that a realistic assessment of programmatic impact could be conducted.

Finally, pilot district evaluations encountered difficult design problems. As previously noted, the pilot programs were generally breaking new ground in terms of instructional strategies in each of the districts for LEP students. This meant that there were constant changes in program implementation as new methodologies were incorporated. High rates of student mobility, school closings, local district testing policies, and constant additional new students throughout the school year are but a few of the factors working against controlled evaluation designs.

The following findings and conclusions represent an aggregation of information collected over time from participating districts within the context of limitations and realities previously identified.

Findings. The information reported in this section is an aggregation of process and product data submitted over the past two years by participating districts. Process evaluation findings also reflect information obtained by Agency personnel during technical assistance and monitoring visits.

Because of the limited number of pilot sites (nine) upon which these findings are based, steps have been taken to ensure anonymity of districts with respect to specific findings. Results have also been grouped by elementary and secondary level distinctions. The balance of this section is devoted to: (1) process evaluation across all nine participating districts, (2) product evaluation for elementary level pilot programs, and (3) product evaluation for secondary level pilot programs.

Process Evaluation. The extent to which process evaluation data were available varied among districts and within districts over time. Varying degrees of evaluation capability and support meant that process evaluation data ranged from informal observations made sporadically over the duration of the program to extensive, formal process evaluation procedures including structured classroom observations utilizing standardized instrumentation. Regardless of the method of data collection, the majority of districts reported that program implementation was taking place, but not always as designed. It was frequently recognized that consistency of implementation across classrooms within a campus and among campuses within a district was problematic at best. As noted in a monitoring team visit to one district:

> "The most common observation made by the team members was the lack of consistency from school to school in the pilot program. The differences were so great that the data from various sites should be treated first as discrete entities. We suspect that there will be significant differences among the sites."

There was a small number of pilot districts which had few difficulties with respect to actual classroom activities matching the program design. These efforts can best be characterized by the extensive administrative and supervisory support made available to the pilot program. This type of support was frequently made possible only through a commitment of additional funds from local or federal sources.

Virtually all pilot programs placed a great deal of emphasis on the need to have extensive staff development for teachers in the program. The implementation of new instructional strategies mandated that appropriate training be provided to staff. Evaluations of the staff development programs generally found excellent attendance rates and high ratings with respect to the quality and applicability of most staff development sessions. In fact, the majority of teachers surveyed stated that they did use techniques learned through staff development. Staff development activities included topics such as:

- Program overview
- Videotape presentations of classroom practices

- Language learning through context
- Total physical response methodology
- Outcome-based instruction
- Make It, Take It material development

At least two districts made a study of time-on-task, and in the case of one district, this information was linked to student achievement. Results of these studies provided two interesting findings. At one pilot site, all teachers were observed during two different class periods by outside observers. It was found that over 95 percent of the time allocated was being spent on instruction. Findings from the other district, linking time-on-task to achievement, showed that merely logging a large amount of time-on-task was not sufficient to ensure achievement. It was recognized that the nature and appropriateness of the tasks engaging students could not be overlooked.

Process evaluation findings reported from one district were characteristic of most pilot programs. The evaluator noted that:

> "Both programs (traditional bilingual and the pilot) were characterized with several positive attributes. These attributes included a high percentage of positive reinforcement in the classes, good participation from students, a high percentage of enthusiastic and motivated teachers, and overall good classroom climate."

A concern raised in some district reports and during monitoring visits was the wide variance in class size. In a number of districts, pilot program classrooms had inordinately large enrollments because of space and scheduling constraints or a student demand which far exceeded the district's ability to provide services. At the other extreme, a monitoring visit found one pilot classroom with a certified bilingual teacher, a part-time oral language teacher, a bilingual aide, a Chapter 1 aide, and a counselor for 22 LEP students. Other observations documented class sizes of under ten.

Programs operating at the secondary level constantly encountered scheduling problems for students. When large blocks of time were required for intensive language development, it was often difficult to find appropriate classroom space for instruction. Furthermore, identification of appropriate time for pilot classes during the school day frequently created problems with respect to scheduling other courses.

Recognizing that process evaluation during formative stages of program development tends to focus on problems encountered, it was encouraging that most teachers when asked if they would like to continue with the pilot program said "yes."

Product Evaluation-Elementary. The five pilot programs operating at the elementary level provided some measure of English language development and basic skills achievement for pilot program students as well as a comparison group.

For the four districts which conducted some form of norm-referenced testing of students, results were extremely mixed and generally inconclusive. Only one district conducting a post-test-only analysis found results consistently favoring comparison students across all subtests analyzed. The extent to which pre-existing differences may have impacted the results is unknown. All other pilot sites reported standardized test results which showed no difference between students in immersion or ESL settings when compared to students in a dual language transitional program. Where mixed results were observed, they generally favored pilot program participants.

Even when results seemed to indicate greater success for pilot program participants over a comparable group of students in traditional bilingual programs, evaluators were quick to temper the results. An example of this type of cautious optimism can be found in following reported finding:

> "Overall gains in language, math, and composite scores are higher for pilot students, but it is not possible to attribute this success entirely to the Immersion Pilot. Students in the Pilot schools have a history of higher achievement than students in the non-Pilot schools. Nevertheless, it is clear that the Pilot program was effective, particularly at grades two, three and five."

In summarizing results of standardized test data, two important points must be recognized. For students in Grades 2 through 5, growth measured on tests generally represent a wide variety of educational experiences prior to participation in the pilot program. Hence, growth or failure observed through achievement testing cannot be solely attributable to the impact of the pilot program. The second point is that students in both the pilot and traditional programs generally showed growth in percentile rank. That is, both programs had positive effects on student achievement.

An examination of results of English language proficiency growth generally found pilot students demonstrated greater gains. In only one case did regular bilingual students outperform pilot students in English language proficiency growth. This particular finding should not be surprising given the added attention to English in partial and total English immersion programs. As with the results obtained in achievement testing, all programs (pilot and comparison) demonstrated the capacity to raise language proficiency scores.

Product Evaluation-Secondary. Assessment of student achievement at the secondary level focused on English language development as measured by language proficiency tests and content acquisition in academic subjects, measured through curriculum imbedded tests and norm-referenced tests. Of the six pilot sites providing evaluation information at the secondary level, two reported results of a comparison group of students receiving basic ESL instruction for one period per day. Comparative results yielded essentially opposite findings at the two sites. In one case, students in the uniquely structured dual language setting for ESL outperformed a comparable group of students in the traditional English only ESL approach. The other pilot program found achievement gains favoring non-pilot students. In both settings, growth was observed for all students (pilot and non-pilot) and comparisons dealt with the magnitude of the gains.

The aggregated results for the other four pilot programs found that content area academic achievement was enhanced where classes were either sheltered (i.e., limited only to LEP students) or specific ESL methodologies were employed in instruction. Virtually all sites met their program objectives in terms of content area acquisition.

Results of English language development were largely dependent on the amount of time allocated for specialized language development. Where pilot programs devoted large blocks of academic time to English language skill development, it was observed that, "students begin the program reading, at best, at the primary grade levels. They exit at middle school or junior high grade levels."

Because of the dramatic variance in student needs at the secondary level, it is difficult to isolate program impact with respect to previous educational experiences. Pilot programs addressed the needs of students ranging from unschooled teenagers to individuals who had completed secondary programs in Mexico. Recognizing these differences, evaluators at one site noted that "In addition to growing academically, students are participating in normal campus life. They join clubs and ROTC, play sports and are even chosen for the National Honor Society. Some are even going on to college."

Pilot programs which focused on ESL in the content areas and did little to expand formal English language development beyond the customary one period of ESL observed less growth in student English proficiency than districts implementing multiple periods of language development. It would appear that while content acquisition occurs, to the extent that students obtain passing grades in their sheltered academic subject courses, growth in English proficiency is limited.

These interim findings demonstrate that unique circumstances impacted virtually all programs. What is most significant to acknowledge at this point in time is that (1) alternative programs for LEP students appear to be obtaining comparable results where comparisons can made and (2) historical trends of failure and high dropout rates at the secondary level can be reversed through appropriate instructional programs aimed at the needs of LEP students in Grades 7-12.

Conclusions. The following conclusions are based on interim, preliminary findings from a limited number of volunteer districts. For many of the participating districts, these conclusions reflect the general findings resulting from the first two years of a five-year longitudinal study.

1. Results of district evaluations conducted over the past two years at pilot sites indicate that at the elementary level there is no consistent or significant documentation which validates the effectiveness of one instructional approach over another. With only one exception, all pilot programs, regardless of approach, reported gains for participants that were equal to or greater than students in comparison settings receiving traditional bilingual instruction. No distinction could be made among districts that would allow for determination of preference of a particular pilot instructional design (i.e., intensive ESL, immersion, or bilingual transfer). Further investigation over time may provide answers to questions concerning the effectiveness of particular instructional approaches. At the secondary level, successful programs are those which expanded the time dimension of English language development and provided sheltered content courses aimed at ensuring greater student success and knowledge acquisition. While dual language programs were not found at the secondary level, examples of the use of primary language assistance were found to be successful.

2. The provisions of TEC 21.451 (e) et seq. which allow for pilot programs utilizing alternative instructional strategies should be continued. School district personnel that have been involved in the pilot effort have consistently sought assurance that their pilot programs would be given sufficient time to demonstrate the success or failure of those alternative instructional practices. The first cohort of kindergarten students who were taught entirely in an alternative setting are now in the second grade. There has not been sufficient time to ascertain and attribute quantifiable differences between students in alternative programs and those in traditional bilingual settings. As these students approach mandatory statewide assessment requirements and qualify for local district standardized achievement testing in Grades 2 through 4, stronger implications may become evident. It is further anticipated that subsequent results from participating districts in the longitudinal design will continue to provide meaningful research data.

3. The recent developments pertaining to federal interest in and financal support for immersion programs, combined with the small but growing interest on the part of local districts to try an alternative approach for LEP students, indicate that new sites should be considered for pilot status. The 1984-85 school year found both Robstown ISD and El Paso ISD initiating ESL immersion efforts at the elementary level based on existing pilot program designs. Similar expansion under the direction and approval of the Commissioner of Education would be appropriate for the 1985-86 school year. New programs should be adaptations of program designs which are considered appropriate given the pilot program efforts reported herein.

4. The requirements of TEC 21.451 (e) et seq., as applicable to secondary level LEP students, are largely inadequate to meet the needs of most identified LEPs at that level. In light of recent increases in funding for bilingual and compensatory students (LEP students at the secondary level generally qualify for both), educational programs specifically designed for these students must be enlarged and better focused to ensure success and increase the educational opportunities for such students. Steps will have to be taken to examine the implications of Chapter 75 requirements and the mandates of H.B. 72 with respect to meeting the educational needs of this unique student population. An exemplary design for a secondary program to address this population is provided in the Appendix under El Paso ISD. It is recognized that the extent to which a district has a sufficiently large secondary level LEP population will determine the ability to provide services. Consistent with this conclusion is the need to improve communication and dissemination of information concerning bilingual programs for the secondary level.

5. The existing supply of certified and trained teachers is insufficient to meet the present, and more importantly, future demand. The number of identified LEP students at all levels, pre-K through Grade 12, is increasing. Participating pilot districts were involved in a variety of university and district based programs designed to meet certification and/or endorsement requirements. Further study of the success of this involvement should be conducted. These efforts might focus on minimal ESL methodology requirements for all elementary teachers and English teachers at the secondary level.

The above conclusions generally conform with the federal perspective as outlined in a recent report. The Condition of Bilingual Education in the Nation specifically mentioned the need to give greater flexibility and more decision-making responsibility to school districts in deciding how best to identify and then serve LEP students.

APPENDIX

Laredo ISD
ESL Partial Immersion in Grades K-2

This program modified the requirements of the Bilingual Education Program by utilizing only one-fourth of the day for Spanish instruction and the rest of the day for intensive oral language instruction in English. Spanish is used, primarily in kindergarten, to the extent necessary so as not to deny children the opportunity to learn successfully. At the kindergarten level, the program focuses on improvement of English proficiency skills through a planned educational environment and intensive instruction in English. An eclectic and multidisciplinary approach which utilizes viable theories of learning such as the cognitive theory, language experience, and use of learning centers provide the framework for the instructional activities. Students receive intensive daily instruction in oral language skills in self-contained classrooms.

The cognitive approach to learning a second language emphasizes using the mental process to understand the function of the new language. In English as a second language instruction, cognitive learning involves internalizing the structures and rules of English which govern each level of language the student encounters. Language-cognition includes receptive vocabulary, understanding the language stimuli and concepts, and production (verbal skills).

Appropriate and relevant concepts, vocabulary, and syntactical structures drawn from the content of the Kindergarten Systems (Economy and Coronado) and the English basal reader (Macmillan Series r) provide the curriculum basis for the intensive English Oral Language Program. The instructional model, based on an identified educational need of kindergarten children with limited English proficiency (LEP) in LISD, includes a daily routine and schedule of activities.

Students will receive daily instruction in oral English skills during three-fourths of the day as reflected in the Daily Schedule of activities. A set of criteria and guidelines based on the District's ESL Continuum and Reading Continuum determine the levels of competency in English oral language skills. Checklists include items of content (sounds, vocabulary, syntax, and comprehension/communication skills) to be mastered as specific skills in English. As the teacher develops the language program, continuous assessment of English skills requires use of these checklists. The teacher guides the students through a series of instructional activities in the classroom which stress a specific skill area and determine the level of mastery or lack of mastery by the student in the specific language skill.

The thrust of the instructional program in the first and second grade is to continue the development or oral language skills in English and conceptual development as well as the development of reading skills in English through an intensive ESL approach and Language Experience Approach. Formal English reading and writing skills are introduced in the first grade. Emphasis is on the teaching of basic elements of spoken English: pronunciation, sentence patterns, and vocabulary.

McAllen ISD
Bilingual Transfer and Total English Immersion K-2

This program has two dramatically different strategies being implemented under the authority of pilot program status. The first approach, operating at three elementary campuses, is an implementation of existing Bilingual Program requirements focusing on when transition from the primary language to the second language occurs. Hence, two languages of instruction are employed but students have greatly varying amounts of time in either language depending on the development of the student. The instructional strategies employed are consistent with a dual language, transitional approach. What is of greater significance is the district's overall Outcome-Based instructional program. By utilizing this strategy and incorporating recent "effective schools" research findings, student achievement in all programs can be expected to show increases. Finally, the Bilingual Transfer Model can best be understood through the research objectives:

1. To design a model for ensuring effective transition from Spanish to English reading focusing on the concept of transferability of skills.

2. To identify a set of appropriate instructional materials and assessment instruments in Spanish and in English relevant to the design requirement.

3. To provide a systematic staff development program for participants in the experimental pilot program.

4. To assess the project student participants regarding levels of attainment of an effective transition from Spanish to English reading focusing on the concept of transferability.

The second approach being studied in McAllen ISD is an all English Immersion Model. Starting with kindergarten students at one campus in the 1982-83 school year, the immersion approach has centered on all English instruction utilizing appropriate ESL methodologies. Activities within the self-contained classroom involve a variety of learning centers at the kindergarten level and prescribed daily functions for students in the first and second grade. As with the Bilingual Transfer Model, the immersion approach is part of the more pervasive instructional design operating throughout the district.

Fort Worth ISD
Total English Immersion K-5

This program implemented what is commonly referred to as a displacement language program. Students enrolled in the program, recognizing differences among individual campuses, received all instruction in English. Their teachers had little or no knowledge of the primary language of the children. Because of the characteristics of students at some pilot sites, it was not unusual to find more than one foreign language represented among the students in a classroom. Consistent with other immersion efforts, teachers use special methodologies and materials to teach English; however, unlike other pilot sites, content area instruction is largely unchanged.

Ability grouping at virtually all grades is utilized as a means of ensuring a sufficient number of students with similar needs. This allows for more effective and efficient instruction. This frequently means that teachers have fewer preparations; hence, greater attention can be given to the depth and appropriateness of lessons.

Because the pilot project operates in a number of schools having fluctuating LEP populations from one year to the next, individual schools are encouraged to make appropriate instructional design changes. Ultimately, this means that continuity of program design across campuses as well as over time cannot be assured.

As previously noted, teachers use a variety of materials and grouping patterns for instruction. Patterns of Language, the Peabody Language Kit, and Yes! English for Children are used to some extent at all pilot campuses. Individual teacher preference for materials is allowed to dictate what is actually used. Pilot teachers place greatest emphasis on English phonics skills, conversational English, and "classroom" English. At the upper grades, focus shifts to higher level skill development.

In conclusion, this approach is an attempt to improve traditional, non-bilingual teachers' skills and awareness in addressing the needs of the LEP student in the regular self-contained and/or departmentalized educational setting.

Brownsville ISD
ESL Partial Day and ESL in the Content Areas

The program consists of a two-hour block of intensive English language development using several second language methods and required content area instruction utilizing English as a second language methods and supplementary Spanish language instruction by fluent bilingual teachers. Instructional strategies focus on the functional approach to communicative competence. This is an approach which emphasizes the development of language use (meaning, function, and communicative ability) as a prerequisite to the development of language usage (linguistic rules and skills). Efforts are made to provide the student with meaningful and functional English language experiences by recreating situational activities in which the student must communicate thought processes in English. Reading and writing activities are provided for the intermediate and advanced level student.

The Innovative Secondary English Language Development System uses a theme-unit-topic approach. The themes were generated from a Student Interest and Concerns Survey and an analysis of teachers' perception of students' interests. This approach develops skills within the context of authentic communication experiences. Exercises provide for real interaction experiences incorporating the elements of motivation, readiness, instruction, reinforcement, and evaluation. The units stress the development of communicative competence by creating situations in which students use new language for functional purposes.

Because the expected output of the ELD classes in English language communicative competency, the system promotes the idea that input must be comprehensible and meaningful English language. Teachers in the program are encouraged to make minimal use of the primary language.

However, when students attend content area classes, the expected output is learned concepts; consequently the input must be comprehensible content. For this reason, teachers are allowed to use primary language assistance (PLA) as an instructional strategy.

Staff development is a vital facet of the system. All staff members are provided a very thorough orientation of the system's philosophy and objectives. To assure maximum success, the system is designed to provide:

- consensus on theoretical base
- a planned process for introduction and dissemination of the system
- continued teacher input and development
- ongoing local and outside resource in support of implementation.

Houston ISD
Total English Immersion and ESL in Content Areas

The Total English Immersion Pilot Program has two distinct components: (1) intensive ESL instruction in ESL resource centers and ESL methods and techniques in all-English content area classrooms and (2) ESL and DISTAR Oral Language in ESL resource centers.

The first approach places students into instructional groups by correlating LAS scores to ESL levels of instruction. Students in ESL Phases I and II receive three hours of intensive ESL instruction daily in a structured listening, speaking, reading and writing program provided by ESL teachers using Yes! English for Children and other appropriate ESL materials. In Phase III, students receive two hours of daily instruction in oral ESL and reading readiness using Yes! English for Children. The balance of the school day is spent in mainstreamed classes requiring minimum English speaking ability such as music, art and physical education, and special content classes where ESL methods and techniques are used.

The second approach uses the Reading/Language Arts periods to allow for grouping of students for specific instructional strategies. Phase I and II students receive Yes! English for Children ESL and DISTAR oral language instruction from English resource teachers. Phase III and IV students are placed in the regular English basal reading program and receive their instruction in English with ESL techniques. For all other instruction, LEP students are mainstreamed with non-LEP students.

The ESL Content Area (Secondary) Pilot Program is designed to serve large concentrations of LEP students in order to improve academic achievement in English/Language Arts, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies and their English language proficiency. Appropriately certified content area teachers with ESL methodology training receive assistance from consultants, inservice training in using and refining adapted curriculum, and staff development support. Students receive instruction in the content areas using ESL as the instructional mode.

Port Arthur ISD
ESL Partial Day

This program was the only pilot dealing with concentrations of LEP students with a language other than Spanish. While qualified staff was available, the pilot compared two different approaches for instructing middle school, junior high Vietnamese speaking students. One experienced classroom teacher devoted the standard period of ESL instruction to ESL methodology with a mixture of students representing numerous languages. The other teacher, a Vietnamese-speaking male, provided instruction utilizing the bilingual (dual language) approach.

Both settings employed appropriate ESL techniques but differed with respect to language of instruction. During the 1983-84 school year, a change in staffing with respect to the Vietnamese instructor led to a third approach. This approach utilized ESL strategies supplemented with first language (Vietnamese) explanations. Another unique aspect was the extremely small class sizes brought about because of scheduling constraints.

Instruction in all other content area classes was traditional mainstream, all English. Pilot and ESL classes allocated some instructional time to supportive vocabulary development appropriate for participating students' other classes.

Dallas ISD
ESL Partial Day/Total English Immersion
ESL in the Content Areas

In K-Grade 4, the basic instructional design consists of a self-contained total English immersion setting for most of the students. A departmentalized setting exists at the third and/or fourth grades. The English oral language proficiency level as well as other pertinent data available such as achievement test scores, criterion referenced tests, and teacher observation, is the basis for student grouping.

English oral language development is the focus of the State Pilot Project. Vocabulary development and specific sentence structures are emphasized throughout the curriculum. Students receive at least one hour of structured ESL instruction and vocabulary development. The remainder of the day consists of reinforcing those ESL objectives as well as providing an ESL instructional approach in the following areas:

- reading/writing or informal reading/writing skills
- science
- social studies
- math

Oral language activities in the areas of art and music are part of the daily curriculum. An ESL list of language standards and objectives is utilized in planning the student's ESL instructional program and in monitoring individual student progress. The District's Curriculum Presecription VII is used to prescribe activities to meet these specific language objectives. Curriculum Prescription VII lists a prescribed set of ESL English oral language activities designed to meet the needs of LEP students enrolled in an English immersion classroom. Lessons reflect the use of English as a second language standards and objectives, the State adopted ESL text, DISD ESL Baseline Curriculum Levels I & II, as well as the activities from Curriculum Prescription VII. Student progress in math, science, and social studies is monitored with the appropriate subject area standards and objectives which are used in planning instruction. All these standards and objectives constitute the district's curriculum which must be taught to all students. Concepts and skills taught in a specific subject area depend on the student's English language profiency and the present level of achievement in that area.

The State Pilot Project at the secondary level serves limited English proficient students in Grades 7 and 8. The instructional approach utilized to teach these students is dependent on their English proficiency levels according to LAS II. A combination of instructional approaches is utilized in order to meet the needs of the LEP population. The following approaches are employed:

- Instructional Approach 1 (ESL Partial Day) provides LAS level 3 students with one period (50 minutes) of structured ESL instruction. The students receive daily instruction from the ESL teacher in reading and writing using an ESL approach. In addition the regular teachers provide students with instruction in the areas of math, social studies, science and/or physical education and two electives.

- Instructional Approach 2 (Total Immersion in English) provides LAS level 1 students with five periods of structured and non-structured ESL instruction in a self-contained classroom setting. Students focus on four basic ESL skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The areas of social studies and science are taught by the ESL teacher using an ESL methodology in that self-contained setting. Math was provided by the regular classroom teacher.

- Instructional Approach 3 (ESL Content Area) provides LAS level 2 students with two periods of structured and non-structured ESL instruction. Unlike Approach 2, these students attend all content area classes (math, science, social studies) with their English-speaking peers. These content area classes are taught using ESL as the instructional mode once all instructors have been trained.

San Felipe-Del Rio Consolidated ISD
ESL in the Content Areas

This program was developed in response to secondary teachers who were having problems with students because teachers were unable to speak or understand Spanish. This meant they could not translate for students and ultimately were unable to appropriately provide instruction in the content areas. It was also apparent that teachers lacked ESL methodology suitable for bridging language gaps.

The main objective of the program in the first year (1981-82) was to provide the necessary training in methodology and techniques in teaching ESL and in developing units of study for LEP students in ESL and in the content areas.

During the last two school years, attention has focused more specifically on actual teaching and achievement of LEP students in ESL classes. A total of five classes participate in the ESL component. In addition, there are three classes in both History-SOL and Biology-SOL. While changes have occurred over the years as teachers try new strategies, the most notable has been the increased use of Spanish in the teaching of the content areas. This dual language approach was deemed necessary to reinforce the content instruction in English.

Staff development is an instrumental part of the program. Beginning during the summer of 1983, all participating teachers in the ESL program attended a 30 hour workshop designed specifically for ESL teachers. The topic of the workshop conducted by outside consultants was Methods and Materials for Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages and Teaching Oral English Language in the Content Areas. Twelve additional hours of staff development were split between topics on ESL Curriculum Techniques and Curriculum Development.

IDENTIFICATION

Home Language Survey

Students who enroll in the district for the first time are to be given a Home Language Survey. The survey is to be signed by the parent or guardian of students in Grades K-8 or by the students themselves in Grades 9-12. The survey is to be kept in each student's cum folder. If the survey is not completed and on file within 10 days of the student's registration, the parent or guardian must be contacted in order to complete the survey. The survey must be completed within four weeks of the student's enrollment. Students who indicate a language other than English in response to either or both of the questions must be tested for language proficiency.

Students Enrolled in the District

Teachers may refer students who are experiencing difficulties in their classwork because they do not understand English. These students are to be referred to the counselor for testing.

Grade 6 Students

Grade 6 students who are classified as limited English proficient (LEP) are to be tested with the Comprehensive English Language Test (CELT) to determine their eligibility to participate as a Grade 7 student in the program. The Language Assessment Scales (LAS) test will be administered at the HILT center.

Special Education Students

Special education services in the resource room include options in English and Spanish for Limited English Proficient students who have been identified as handicapped by the ARD including one professional representing the Language Proficiency Assessment Committee (LPAC). If assessment data indicates that the student may be classified as mentally retarded or learning disabled, students should receive services in Spanish or English as a second language in the resource room.

TESTING

Language Assessment

Language proficiency testing is to be completed no later than 10 days after enrollment.

New Students

At the home campus, new students who speak a language other than English are to be tested by school personnel at the home campus. The students are to be administered both the LA and the SA forms of the Comprehensive English Language Test (CELT). These are group tests which take approximately 40 minutes each to administer. Test kits are available in every school. Schools needing tests, tapes, answer keys, or response sheets are to order them from the Storeroom on a Warehouse Services Transfer and Delivery Receipt. There is no charge. At the HILT center students will be tested with the Language Assessment Scales test (LAS).

Grade 6 Students

Grade 6 LEP students will be tested in the spring of the school year. Schools will be provided with specific procedures in March.

Achievement Testing

All LEP students assigned to ESOL classes in the HILT centers will be administered the appropriate subtests of the California Achievement Test within four weeks of the first day of school. The Office for Research and Evaluation will coordinate achievement testing, and procedures will come directly from that office.

PLACEMENT
Entry/Exit

ENTRY

Eligibility

Students who score 29 or below (fewer than 30 correct responses) on the LA form of the CELT are eligible to be placed in the HILT centers. The names of the students who have fewer than 30 correct responses should be submitted to the Language Proficiency Assessment Committee for its recommendation as to placement. This committee places the students in

the HILT program. Borderline students slightly above the 30 score may also be recommended to the LPAC for placement if there is evidence that they need ESOL. The LAS test will be administered at the HILT center to confirm the recommendation.

Language Proficiency Assessment Committee (LPAC)

A Language Proficiency Assessment Committee should be established on each campus. The committee is to be composed of the principal or assistant principal, a certified teacher with an ESOL assignment, and a parent of a limited English proficient student. When the administration and scoring of the CELT has been completed, the LPAC must begin to function. The committee shall be responsible for the following:

1. make recommendations concerning the most appropriate placement of LEP students;

2. notify the parent(s) or guardian(s) within 10 days of the student's classification as LEP and request parental approval for placement in the HILT program;

3. review the principal's mid-October report to the Associate Superintendent for Instruction which indicates the number of LEP students by campus, and the primary language spoken;

4. review a report in late October of the California Achievement Test pretest results to confirm the classification of students placed in the HILT program; and

5. review each LEP student's progress at the end of the year to determine future placement.

The LPAC should keep a written summary report of each meeting. The report should include the following:

1. any actions taken;

2. recommendations made; and

3. concerns.

Parental Approval

The parent or guardian of a student must be given notice that the student has been tested and classified as LEP. Parents are to be sent a letter that can be requested from the Storeroom. Parents must give us their permission to place their son/daughter in the HILT center program as well as their permission to transport their child to a center if necessary. Permission postcards can be obtained from the Storeroom.

HILT Student Information Form

This form must be filled out for every student placed in a HILT center. It should be filled out very carefully by the home school. All information requested should be included. Students should not be sent to a HILT center without this form. This form contains information important to several departments. The appropriate copy should be forwarded to each department.

Grade Level Placement

The HILT program students should be placed in a grade level based on chronological age. For example, 15 year old students should be placed in a senior high school environment. Self-esteem is significantly and negatively affected when a student is placed with students who are considerably younger.

Language Proficiency Level Placement

Students who score 0-19 on the SA form of the CELT are to be placed in Beginning Level; 20-28, in Intermediate Level; and 29 or above in Advanced Level. See Levels of Instructionon page 64 of this document for more details.

EXIT

A student should complete the transitional level at the HILT center. Once the student has completed this level, he/she is to return to the home school and be enrolled in regular classes. The HILT center will need to initiate proper procedures for the student to be reclassified, exited, and returned to the home school.

A student who does not complete transitional level must have written permission from the parents to exit the program. HILT centers should place the written request in the student's cum folder and then initiate proper procedures for the student to return to the home school.

SUMMARY OF IDENITIFCATION, TESTING, PLACEMENT, AND TRANSPORTATION RESPONSIBILITIES

Responsibilities of the Home School

1. Have a signed Home Language Survey for each student in the cum folder.

2. Have each student who speaks a language other than English tested with the CELT LA and SA forms. Score the tests. Place test scores on the HILT Student Information Form and file tests in the student's cum folder.

3. Establish a Language Proficiency Assessment Committee (LPAC) for the campus. Keep a record of committee meetings and actions taken.

4. Prepare a HILT Student Information Form for each student the LPAC recommends for placement into the HILT. Place this form in the student's cum folder.

5. Notify the student's parent(s) or guardian(s) of their child's classification and the recommended HILT placement. Secure their permission for program placement and for transportation (if necessary). File the acceptance or rejection postcard in the student's cum folder.

6. Prepare a Transportation for HILT Students form and forward. Transportation is provided for students to attend classes at the designated HILT center for the duration of the program. Once parent permission is secured, drop the student and follow normal procedures for transferring a student within the district. If the transfer is being made during the school year, call the Transportation Department at 779-4235 to get the bus number. Follow up with the Transportation for HILT Students form. Attach the **Notice of Student Transfer Between El Paso Independent School District Schools** to the **HILT Student Information Form** and forward to the receiving HILT center. Call the receiving HILT center to communicate the student's transfer.

7. Prepare a Notice of Student Transfer Between El Paso Independent School District Schools form and forward.

8. Send the student's cum folder to the receiving HILT center.

9. Keep a central file of the goldenrod copies of the HILT Student Information Forms (home school's copies).

10. Prepare a HILT Student Roster in the spring and forward it to appropriate HILT center and other departments.

Responsibilities of the HILT Center

1. Administer the California Achievement Test according to the instructions from the Office for Research and Evaluation.

2. Prepare rosters for LAS testing according to the instructions from the Office for Secondary Instruction.

3. Transfer the results of the LAS test to each student's HILT Student Information form.

4. Administer the Metropolitan Achievement Reading Survey (MARS) according to the instructions from the Office for Secondary Instruction.

5. Transfer the results of the MARS to each student's HILT Student Information form.

6. Establish a Language Proficiency Assessment Committee to review the principal's report to the Associate Superintendent for Instruction; reclassify students when necessary; and recommend students for exit when necessary.

7. Initiate all necessary procedures for students to return to their home school.

Responsibilities of the Grade 6 Principals

1. In March prepare a Grade 6 HILT Student Roster and forward as indicated.

2. Have a Home Language Survey for each student in the cum folder.

3. Have each Grade 6 Limited English Proficient (LEP) student tested with the CELT LA and SA forms according to the instructions from the Office for Secondary Instruction.

4. Recommend every eligible student to the Language Proficiency Assessment Committee (LPAC) for possible placement in the HILT center.

5. Prepare a HILT Student Information form for every student whom the LPAC recommends for placement. Place the white form in the student's cum folder and forward other copies upon completion of the steps 6-8 that follow.

6. Notify the student's parent(s) or guardian(s) of their child's classification and secure permission for program placement and for transportation (if necessary). File the acceptance or rejection postcard in the student's cum folder.

7. Prepare a Transportation for HILT Students form and forward all three copies to the Department for Transportation. Indicate that you are requesting transportation for the following school year on the line "Action Requested." Sign your name and give your school name on the line for "Person Requesting Action." The Department for Transportation will return the pink copy to your school so that the Grade 6 student can be given the transporation information prior to the end of school.

8. Forward the pink copy to the home school so that the principal can have the transportation information available if the student misplaces it during the summer.

9. Update the Grade 6 Student Roster and forward to the school or department indicated.

10. Send the cum folder for all HILT students to the receiving HILT center.

THE CURRICULUM

Schooled Students

Beginning level students are enrolled in four classes of ESOL, one class of sheltered mathematics, and one class of physical education or its equivalent.

Intermediate level students are enrolled in three classes of ESOL, one class of sheltered mathematics, one class of sheltered science, and one clas of physical education or its equivalent.

Advanced level students are enrolled in two classes of ESOL, one class of sheltered mathematics, one class of sheltered science, one class of sheltered social studies, and one class of physical education or its equivalent.

Transitional level students are enrolled in one class of sheltered regular or correlated English, one class of sheltered social studies, and four classes can be selected from the regular curriculum.

Students with Limited Schooling

Beginning level A students are enrolled in four classes of ESOL, one native literacy class, and one class of physical education or its equivalent.

Beginning level B students are enrolled in four classes of ESOL, one native literacy class, and one class of pnysical education or its equivalent.

Intermediate level students are enrolled in three classes of ESOL, one sheltered science class, one class of sheltered mathematics, and one physical education or its equivalent.

Advanced level students are enrolled in two classes of ESOL, one class of sheltered mathematics, one class of sheltered science, one class of sheltered social studies, and one class of physical education or its equivalent.

Transitional level students are enrolled in one class of sheltered Basic Reading Skills or Correlated Language Arts, one class of sheltered mathematics, one class of sheltered science, one class of sheltered social studies, and two classes can be selected from the regular curriculum.

Grades 7-8

Grades 7 and 8 students are to select one elective to add to the above schedule. Electives are to be chosen in accordance with the student's language proficiency level. Students with limited proficiency in their native language are encouraged to take Spanish. The higher the proficiency of the student's native language, the easier the acquisition of the second language.

Length of Program

Each level represents one semester in Grades 9-12 and one school year in Grades 7-8. The length of a student's stay in the program depends on the entry level of the student. Some students acquire language at very rapid rates and may be able to skip a level. School personnel should call the program consultant for assitance with these individual cases.

ESOL Courses, Grades 7-12

Course Code Gr. 7	Gr. 8	Grs. 9-12	Course Description	Prerequisite(s)	Comments
J780	J890	E110	ESOL 1a	6 yrs. of schooling in native country, 29 or below on LA Form of CELT, and 0-19 on SA Form of CELT	Listening, Understanding, & Speaking
J781	J891	E115	ESOL 1b		Speaking & Writing
J782	J892	E120	ESOL 1c		Reading & Composition
J783	J893	E125	ESOL 1d		English for Math
J784	J894	E130	ESOL 2a	ESOL 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d or 20-28 on SA Form of CELT	Listening, Understanding, & Speaking
J785	J895	E135	ESOL 2b		Reading & Composition
J786	J896	E140	ESOL 2c		English for Science
J787	J897	E145	ESOL 3a	ESOL 2a, 2b, 2c, or above 28 on SA Form of CELT	Grammar & Literature
J788	J898	E150	ESOL 3b		English for Social Studies
J789	J899	E109	ESOL 1a LS	Less than 6 yrs. of schooling in native country, 29 or below on LA Form of CELT, & 0-19 on SA Form of CELT	Listening, Understanding, & Speaking
J790	J819	E114	ESOL 1b LS		English for the Basic Curriculum
J791	J821	E119	ESOL 1c LS		Prereading & Writing
J792	J822	E124	ESOL 1d LS		Eng. for Fund. Matn
J793	J829	E111	ESOL 2a LS	ESOL 1a LS, 1b LS, 1c LS, and 1d LS	Listening, Understanding, & Speaking
J794	J831	E116	ESOL 2b LS		English for the Basic Curriculum
J795	J832	E121	ESOL 2c LS		Lang. Experience for Reading & Writing
J798	J833	E126	ESOL 2d LS		Eng. for Basic Math
J799	J837	E129	ESOL 3a LS	ESOL 2a LS, 2b LS, 2c LS, and 2d LS	Listening, Understanding, & Communicating
J766	J838	E134	ESOL 3b LS		Reading & Compositio
J767	J839	E139	ESOL 3c LS		English for the Basic Curriculum
J768	J847	E144	ESOL 4a LS	ESOL 3a LS, 3b LS, and 3c LS	Basic Grammar & Literature
J769	J849	E149	ESOL 4b LS		Englisn for the Basic Curriculum

Sheltered Content Courses

Sheltered content classes are those mathematics, science, and social studies courses in which only students of limited English language proficiency are enrolled.

HILT students are placed in sheltered content courses during the time they are enrolled in the HILT centers. The purpose of sheltering the content courses is to enable students to comprehend the course, and to enable teachers to have the opportunity to adjust their instructional methods for these students. Comprehension of the content material is facilitated when the students of limited language proficiency do not have to compete with fluent English speakers. The course content remains the same (some adjustments were made in American history), and students are placed according to proficiency in the content matter.

Sheltered content courses are of paramount importance to the HILT curriculum. Research indicates that exposure to English as a medium of instruction such as biology, for example, shows a more systematic relationship to level of proficiency than the amount of time spent in English class or than length or residence.

Sheltered Mathematics Courses, Grades 9-12

Course Code	Course Description	Prerequisite(s)	Comments
M101	FOM 1a	Grade 9 placement	Score below 20th percentile on CAT or below 18 on HILT Screening for Mathematics Test.* Not open to students who scored above the 40th percentile on CAT or 18 or above on HILT Screening for Mathematics Test.
M111	FOM 1b	FOM 1a	
M201	FOM 2a	Grade 10 placement, FOM 1b	
M211	FOM 2b	Grade 10 placement, FOM 2a	
M501	Introduction to Algebra 1a	Grade 9 placement	Not open to students with credit in Algebra 1a. Score of 1-7 on Algebra portion of the HILT Screening for Mathematics Test* or above the 40th percentile on the CAT.
M511	Introduction to Algebra 1b	Grade 9 placement M501	
M601	Algebra 1a	Grade 9 placement	Score of 8 or more on Algebra portion of HILT Screening for Mathematics Test* or above the 40th percentile on the CAT.
M611	Algebra 1b	Grade 9 placement M601	
M631	Geometry a	M611	

*The Hilt Screening for Mathematics Test is to be used for placement if CAT scores are not available. Request the test from the Storeroom.

Sheltered Science Courses, Grades 9-12

Course Code	Course Description	Prerequisite(s)	Comments
C011	Applied Phys Science 1a	Completion of beginning level ESOL courses	For students also enrolled in sheltered Fundamentals of Math
C021	Applied Phys Science 1b	C011	
C041	Physical Science 1a	Completion of beginning level ESOL course	For students also enrolled in sheltered Algebra or Introduction to Algebra
C051	Physcial Science 1b	C041	
C121	Applied Biology 1a	C021 or C051	
C131	Applied Biology 1b	C121	
C141	Biology 1a	C051	
C151	Biology 1b	C141	

Sheltered Social Studies Courses, Grades 9-12

Course Code	Course Description	Prerequisite(s)	Comments
S011	American History 1a	Completion of intermediate level ESOL courses	
S021	American History 1b	S011	

Sheltered English Courses, Grades 9-12

Course Code	Course Description	Prerequisite(s)	Comments
E301	English 1a	Completion of advanced level ESOL courses and teacher recommendation	
E201	Correlated Lang Arts 1a	Completion of adv. level ESOL courses	

Spanish Literacy Courses, Grades 7-12

Course Code	Course Description	Prerequisite(s)	Comments
F121	Spanish 1as	None	For students enrolled in E109/ J680/J684
F131	Spanish 1bs	F121	For students enrolled in E111

Sheltered Mathematics Courses, Grades 7-8

Course Code	Course Description	Prerequisite(s)	Comments
J708	Math 7	Grade 7 placement	
J808	Math 8	Grade 8 placement	

Sheltered Science Courses, Grades 7-8

Course Code	Course Description	Prerequisite(s)	Comments
J709	Science 7	Grade 7 placement and completion of beginning level ESOL courses	
J813	Science 8	Grade 8 placement and completion of beginning level ESOL courses	

Sheltered Social Studies Courses, Grades 7-8

Course Code	Course Description	Prerequisite(s)	Comments
J714	Social Studies 7	Grade 7 placement and completion of intermediate level ESOL courses	
J814	Social Studies 8	Grade 8 placement and completion of intermediate level ESOL courses	

Sheltered English and Reading Courses, Grades 7-8

Course Code	Course Description	Prerequisite(s)	Comments
J702 J712	English 7 Reading 7	Grade 7 placement and completion of advanced level ESOL courses	
J712 J811	English 8 Reading 8	Grade 8 placement and completion of advanced level ESOL courses	

Textbooks and Materials

There is a materials list available for all ESOL courses. All materials are ordered through the school's bookroom clerk. The bookroom clerks may call Mary Gonzalez at 779-4226 if they have any questions regarding the HILT program materials. Clerks and teachers should consult the ESOL materials list for correct distribution for each text.

Course Guides

A course has been written for every ESOL course. The guides contain the goals, objectives, evaluations, procedures, and materials for each course. It is expected that all ESOL teachers read and study each guide for the courses assigned to them. It is also expected that the teachers will follow the procedures and use the materials provided for each course. If teachers have difficulties interpreting the course guides or using the materials, they are to call the program consultant, Mrs. Rosita Apodaca, at 779-4152. Course guides are ordered through the school's bookroom clerk.

INSTRUCTION

Levels of Instruction

The program design includes four levels of instruction: beginning, intermediate, advanced, and transitional. The student's CELT SA form score determines the level for each student. The score is found in the student's HILT Program Information form. Students who score 0-19 on the SA form of the test are to be placed in Beginning Level; 20-28, in Intermediate Level; and 29 or above, in Advanced Level.

Students are tested only for initial grouping. Once a student is enrolled in the program, the successful completion of a level becomes the prerequisite for the next level.

Once the students are placed within a level, teachers may change the students' level by consulting with all the student's ESOL teachers and the department chairperson and requesting approval of the decision from the school principal by submitting the request in writing.

Errors will be made in the placement of students. Teachers should work with their students at least one week before recommending placement changes. Teachers should meet on all changes to be requested so that

counselors and principals can make scheduling changes only once. Teachers should send students one at a time to counselors for changes.

Limited Schooling Curriculum

Students who have not completed Grade 5 in their native country are to be placed in the Limited Schooling Curriculum. These are separate classes and not a group within a class. There must be at least eight students before a class can be scheduled for these students.

Class Size

The following courses in ESOL are approved for a minimum enrollment of 8 and a maximum of 15 students per class: E109 ESOL 1a LS through E126 ESOL 2d LS.

The following courses are approved for a minimum enrollment of 15 and a maximum of 20 students per class: E129 ESOL 3A LS through E140 ESOL 2c. The remaining courses E144 ESOL 4a LS through E150 ESOL 3b are approved for regular size enrollment.

Every effort must be made not to exceed the maximum enrollments.

Grades

It is expected that the grades which students receive will be based on their performance of the course objectives. Teachers' exams should reflect the course evaluation specified in the course guides. If a student enters the program late and is unable to complete all the work required for a passing grade, the teacher may give that student an "Incomplete" and ask that the student be placed in the same course for the next semester. This is done so that a student is not penalized for arriving late. The "Incomplete" is removed upon successful completion of the course. This procedure is recommended only when students would benefit from repeating a level because of late arrival. This is mostly appropriate at the high school level. Teachers should discuss this with their school administrators and secure approval.

Homework

It is expected that students will be assigned at least one half hour of homework for each course two or three times per week. Students need to be made responsible for their learning, teachers should help them by assigning appropriate homework. Do not assign homework which is not going to be checked, graded, or responded to in some manner.

Native Language Use

Teachers are asked to use their good judgments about when to use the student's native language. Teachers are to use English for instructional purposes and are not required to speak the student's native language to teach in this program. There may be times when it becomes absolutely necessary for the students to have complete comprehension of a situation, event, directions, or the like. Teachers who speak the student's native language may do so in order to ensure comprehension in those situations that require it.

Scheduling

Proper scheduling is of paramount importance to instruction. The HILT program goals will be impaired without proper scheduling. The following recommendations are offered:

1. Make every effort to mix students from the feeder schools with home school students. It will help the students feel less isolated.

2. Shelter the content area classes. It is better for both students and teachers.

3. In Grades 7-8, separate the grades if possible. This is particularly important in the content classes because the content topics are different for the two grade levels.

4. Do not assign students to just one teacher for all their ESOL classes. It is necessary for the students to hear a variety of speech patterns. The assignment is also burdensome for one teacher. We recommend a maximum of three preparations whenever possible.

5. Try to assign teachers to the subjects in which they have experience. This is particularly important in teaching English for math and English for science. ESOL 1a (E110/J780/J890) is a course that requires a very creative and innovative teacher.

6. Do not assign content classes or electives that are beyond the student's language proficiency level. A speech class is inappropriate for the students because of the reading required.

7. Principals should schedule a meeting before school starts for content area teachers and ESOL teachers.

INSTRUCTIONAL METHODOLOGIES

Silent Period

Program teachers are provided with inservice so that they can use the appropriate methodologies with each course. The HILT program design is built on second language acquisition principles. During the past twenty years, teachers and researchers have found some critical ingredients of language acquisition. They have found that when students are not asked to begin speaking the new language immediately, students typically go through a silent period which lasts from a few weeks to several months. This silent period or comprehension period appears to accelerate learning to speak. Our beginning level courses do not require students to produce and practice sentences in the new language at first because it is better to wait awhile.

Language Environment and Methodologies

It also appears that the most beneficial language environment is one in which language is used naturally for communication. Therefore, in the beginning and intermediate levels courses we use the Total Physical Response, The Natural Approach, Language Experience, The Humanistic Approach, and Directed Reading Activities. Teachers receive training in the use of these methodologies and techniques so that they can use them to teach the courses and to adapt any materials that require the adaptation. Unfortunately, materials are often not up to date with current research. This program does not use audio-lingual methods based on behavioristic psychology and structuralism. Any material based on this methodology will require adaptation.

Comprehensible Input

Another critical ingredient to successful language acquisition is that the students be provided with comprehensible, interesting, and relevant input that is not grammatically sequenced. Language acquisition activities require that the student comprehend the message. Structures are acquired only when there is comprehension. Students will acquire very little from a lesson if they cannot understand the message. The teachers must ensure that comprehension takes place. The more interesting and relevant a lesson is to the student, the better the chances are that the language will be acquired. The lesson should be so interesting that the student is focused on the content and not on the language form. The student should be focused on communication.

Natural Learning Order

Researchers have found that most people, whether their first language is French, Spanish, or Hindi, acquire a working knowledge of certain structures in English in a fairly set order. This natural learning order is observed regardless of the order in which the structures are presented in the language curriculum. The order of acquisition has nothing to do with our sense of what's hard and what's easy. Some things that look easy come late (third person singular). Some difficult things are acquired early (progressive). The order of acquisition is independent of, immune to, and unaffected by the textbook, the teacher, or the syllabus. A structure will be acquired only when its time has come.

Language Errors

Perhaps the most surprising finding in second language acquisition is in regard to the errors which second language learners make. For several decades, it was assumed that most second language errors resulted from differences between the first and second languages. Researchers have learned that only 5% of the grammatical errors which children make (and, at most, 20% of the ones which adults make) can be traced to crossover from the first language.

Error Correction

Another surprising finding is that correcting students' grammatical errors does not produce much improvement. Students should not be corrected, instead teachers should model. Correction should be delayed until the time when students have acquired some fluency in the language. During the silent period, the students make their mistakes in the privacy of their own mind.

Affective Filter

There should be a low-stress atmosphere in the second language classroom. Students do not like to make mistakes, they like to be successful. Self-confidence and lack of anxiety are characteristics that predict success in second language acquisition. Self-confident students who are highly motivated will interact more and thus obtain more input for acquisition. The students' anxiety and lack of motivation can be the greatest obstacles in acquiring a second language. The student's anxiety level, motivation to learn a language and his/her peer identification make up what is known as the affective filter. The affective filter acts to control entry of language into the language acquisition device (located in the left part of the brain) for further mental processing. The affective filter needs to be down in order for language acquisition to take place. The fundamental principle of second language acquisition says that anything that works for second language acquisition is really comprehensible input delivered in a low anxiety situation.

Language Acquisition and Language Learning

Language acquisition and language learning are fundamentally different processes. Acquistion is central and is responsbile for fluency. It takes place best under the conditions previously described. Fluency is what this program strives to develop in the beginning and the intermediate levels. Once the students have "picked up" a great deal of language, they can learn about the language. Language learning is a deliberate and conscious attempt to teach from. The teacher provides the language rules and explains the language rules. The students use the formal rules and the teacher corrects their errors in the use of those rules. This is explicit, formal knowledge--the grammar of the language. In order for the students to think about and use the rules effectively, they must have time to think about and use the rules. They must be focused on form and they must know the rule. The advanced and transitional levels focus on grammar. It is at this stage where error correction is thought to be useful. Error correction can be useful in language learning when it serves to inform the learner that his/her current version of the conscious rule is wrong. Error correction should be limited to written work and grammar exercises. Teacners should not correct errors during communicative practice unless errors interfere with communication, cause unfavorable reactions, or are errors which are made frequently. The methodologies used at the advanced and transitional level are those previously mentioned as well as increased directed reading activities, composition work, and grammar exercises.

Suggestions to the Teacher

Teachers will need to find ways to make their lessons and presentations comprehensible to a nonnative speaker, regardless of his/her level of competence in the target language. Teachers can make their language more comprehensible by doing the following:

1. Using a slower rate of speed and clearer articulation, which helps students to identify word boundaries more easily, and allows more processing time;

2. Using high-frequency vocabulary, less slang, few idioms; and

3. Using simplified syntax and shorter sentences.

Extralinguistic support in the form of realia and visuals is a must. It is a very important part of the tools which the teachers must use to encourage language acquisition. Teachers will also need to find ways to motivate the student. See the next section for more details.

THE STUDENTS

Students who are classified as Limited English Proficient (LEP) may attend a HILT center. These students are generally foreign born, recent arrivals to this country who need to acquire and learn English so that they can function in American junior or senior high schools. These students are from a variety of educational and cultural backgrounds. Some arrive highly motivated and some do not. Some arrive with excellent educational backgrounds and some without any education at all. The administrators, counselors, and teachers of the HILT centers are most willing to help all students achieve their maximum potential. The following section is included with the hope that it will be helpful in understanding the students' perspectives so that their needs can be addressed.

Effects of Individual Differences on Second Language Acquisition

"Social and affective factors and differing cognitive learning styles have been found to significantly affect second language learning. The attitude of learners toward the cultural group that speaks the second language and their greater or lesser desire to participate in that group has as much effect on the success of their second language acquisition as do their aptitude and verbal intelligence. According to Lambert (1981), a favorable set of attitudes and motivation can compensate for a lack of natural aptitude for acquiring a second language and can predict successful learning of that language. The implications for educators are clear. Students can develop positive feelings about native English speakers only if those speakers are concerned caring individuals to whom limited English proficient students can relate personally. Educators should not only examine their own attitudes, but also strive to establish attitudes of acceptance, appreciation, and esteem in their native-English-speaking students."*

Motivation

Three related types of motivation have been observed to affect second language learning: integrative motivation, or the desire to participate in the life of the community that speaks the language; instrumental motivation, or the desire to use the language for practical reasons; and the social group identification motive, which is the desire to acquire proficiency in a language spoken by a social group with which the learner identifies. The implications for educators are clear. Students must be integrated or must be motivated to become members of the "English speaking club;" must have a real reason for using English; and must accept and develop esteem for the English-speaking group. This is certainly a big job for educators, but a most necessary one.

---

*Chamot-Uhl, Anna. (1981) "Applications of Second Language Acquisition," FOCUS, Number 8: 1-8

Student's Model Preference

Some evidence indicates that students who are acquiring a second language have preference for certain speaker models. These preferences seem to have obvious effects on the quality of the student's speech. They prefer peers over teachers, peers over parents, and their own ethnic group members over nonmembers. Thus, students most often acquire the dialect used by their peers rather than the dialect used by teachers or parents. Some students have been observed to tend towards the dialect spoken by members of their own ethnic group rather than the other groups. The availability of different speaker models is a key factor operating to affect the quality of the language which students produce.

Age and Personality

Age and personality are individual characteristics of individual learners which have been shown to have a marked effect on second language acquisition. Research indicates that a low anxiety level and the tendency to be outgoing have a positive effect on second language acquisition. Thus, self-confident students usually are better language acquirers. Age does affect the rate and the quality of second language acquisition.

Children appear to be much more successful than adults in acquiring the phonological system of the new language, and many eventually attain native-like accents.

Most children are ultimately more successful than adults in learning a second language, but they are not always faster. Adults appear to progress faster than children in the areas of syntax and morphology, at least in the early stages of learning.

Expectations

It is most important to set expectations for students. Teachers who expect nothing and receive nothing should give students an "A+" because the students met their expectations. The HILT program teachers should expect the students to meet the course objectives. The students should know the teacher's expectations as well as the course objectives from the first day of class. Do not expect students to behave, think, or have the same values as the American high school students. They need to be made knowledgeable about the American way of life, in and out of school. They need to know the rules, the activities, the expectations, and how these might be different from theirs. It is important to respect their ways and not to make them feel that those ways are neither inferior nor superior, just different. Students coming from countries that are not industrialized will find this country very different. The entire technological background needs to be put into place. Students coming from industrialized countries will find our rules, systems, values, and so on, different. Teachers, counselors, administrators must not assume that the students know the rules, systems, and values. Everything must be explained.

Use of the Target Language

Students do not mean to be disrespectful when they use their native language. It is natural for them to speak to their peers in the native language. Beginning level students are struggling to understand. They generally do not have the vocabulary to express all they want to say. Do not expect students to speak beyond their level of proficiency. Encourage the use of English, but do not be unreasonable in your demands. Sometimes students do not understand and they must use the native language to ask someone for help or information. Remember that speaking ability emerges on its own after enough competence has been developed by listening and understanding. We acquire spoken fluency not by practicing talking but by understanding input. It is, in fact, theoretically possible to acquire language without ever talking. Speaking or output does have an indirect contribution to make to language acquisition. That is, the more a student speaks, the more people will talk to him/her. In fact, it affects the quantity of input as well as the quality of the output. Speaking should be encouraged, but not to the detriment of the student. It should be done in a positive manner.

THE TEACHER

The program teachers are very dedicated, enthusiastic, and accepting individuals. The contribute to the academic and affective worlds of their students. They have prepared most of the course guides, selected program materials, and written some of the specialized content ESOL curriculum guides. The teachers are the persons most responsible for the success this program enjoys.

ESL Endorsement

In 1982-83, teachers of English as a second language were required to hold a special endorsement.

All those who have taught ESL during 1981-82 will be safeguarded under the new ruling. This means that these teachers will be permitted to continue to teach ESL without the new endorsement as long as they remain with the El Paso Independent School District. Should they transfer to another school district in Texas, the "grandfather" clause will not be applicable and they would be requried to obtain the new endorsement.

The Texas Education Agency will evaluate each teacher for the Englisn as a Second Language endorsement at his/her request. If a teacher desires such an evaluation, please call Mrs. Marilyn Allen at 779-4336 for an appointment. Teachers must sign an application. There is no fee for this service.

The ESL endorsement requires twelve hours of course work plus teaching experience in ESL.

Requirements of Program

Prerequisite:

Valid (classroom) Texas Elementary, All-Levels, Librarian (based on Elementary or Secondary), Vocational Homemaking, Deaf and/or Severely Hard of Hearing, Speech and Hearing Therapy, or Junior High/High School certificate, based on completion of a college-approved teacher education program.

Course Requirements:

Ling. 347 Linguistic Description and Analysis

Ling. 3448 Analysis of Second Language Acquisition

Ed. C. 3436 English as a Second Language Methodology in the Content Areas

Ed. C. 3440 Reading and Writing in English as a Second Language

Additional Requirements:

Evidence of successful student teaching in an approved ESL program or one year of successful classroom teaching experience (on a permit) in an ESL program as documented by the employing superintendent.

Course Descriptions:

Ling. 3471 (Topic VI) Linguistic Description and Analysis--description and analysis of the phonology, morphology, and syntax of English in the context of analyses of representative languages of the Indo-European and other language families.

Ling. 3448 Analysis of Second Language Acquisition--a theoretical and practical examination of various (though complementary) theories of second language learning, with their implications for the second language classroom.

Ed. C. 3436 English as a Second Language Methodology in the Content Areas --acquisition and use of second language methodology and techniques for teaching in the content areas. Prerequisite: Ling. 3308

Ed. C. 3440 Reading and Writing in English as a Second Language--a study of the acquisition of reading and writing proficiency in English by literate and nonliterate speakers of minority languages in Texas. Emphasis will be on the diagnosis and prescription of reading and writing difficulties encountered by limited English proficiency students and oral language dominance and proficiency testing. Particular attention will be given to the prescription and preparation of oral language development activities that correlate with the acquisition of literacy skills in Grades K-12. A laboratory of field experience in an ESL setting will be required. Prerequisite: Ed. C. 3404 or permission of instructor

Inservice Education

The school district provides inservice workshops for the program teachers. Teachers are notified of the workshops via the school principal. Teachers are encouraged to attend all voluntary workshops and inservice meetings. The ESOL inservice has received very high ratings from the program teachers. All inservice is conducted by the program consultant, experienced program teachers, and second language experts. Teachers are encouraged to suggest presenters as well as topics for inservice and may contact the program consultant to offer any suggestions.

Department Chairpersons

The HILT program has an ESOL department chairperson at each center. This chairperson can answer many questions about the program and can be of assistance to the program teachers. The chairperson disseminates information to the program teachers. Teachers should contact the chairperson for help they may need.

Program Consultant

The consultant provides assistance in all aspects of the program. Mrs. Rosita Apodaca is the consultant for the HILT program. Call her at 779-4152 for any assistance you may need. She will be glad to conduct classroom demonstrations, provide campus or individualized inservice, provide any resources you need for the program, conduct classroom observations, and provide feedback to teachers on the observation. Call her with any questions you may have or to report any exciting events happening in your classroom, to discuss ways on how to improve the program, or to share a productive technique so that it can be shared with the other HILT center teachers. You may also call to offer help in any area that you would like to work in.

TEXTESOL I

Teachers who seek professional growth, comaraderie, and opportunities to meet other ESOL professionals can join the local organization known as TEXTESOL I (Texas Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. TEXTESOL I was the first Texas affiliate of international TESOL.) The organization sponsors an annual conference, seminars, a scholarship dance, make n' takes, and awards a $1,000 scholarship to the TESOL Summer Institute. Mrs. Judy Thomas of Beall School is membership chairperson. Her home telephone number is 581-4922.